ED 315 597   CE 054 074

TITLE   New York City Adult Literacy Initiative. Final Report
               for Fiscal Year 1986.
INSTITUTION   Literacy Assistance Center, New York, NY.
SPONS AGENCY   New York City Office of the Mayor, N.Y.; New York
               State Education Dept., Albany.
PUB DATE   87
NOTE   67p.; For related documents, see CE 054 072-073 and
               CE 054 076.
PUB TYPE   Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   *Accountability; Adult Basic Education; Adult
               Literacy; Basic Skills; Community Organizations;
               Cooperative Programs; Educational Administration;
               *English (Second Language); Functional Literacy;
               *Library Extension; *Literacy Education; Program
               Effectiveness; *Program Implementation; Public
               Libraries; Universities
IDENTIFIERS   *New York (New York); *New York City Adult Literacy
               Initiative

ABSTRACT
        Following an introduction, this final report presents
the bulk of its information in sections on (1) the literacy services
of the City University of New York, community-based organizations,
and the New York City Board of Education; and (2) the literacy
services of the New York City public library. Within the first
section, the following subjects are addressed: (1) provider agencies;
(2) student information such as their numbers, type of instruction,
level of instruction, types of programs, race, ethnicity, gender,
age, and employment status; (3) amount of instruction students
receive; (4) student achievement, including posttest information,
students who showed test gains, evaluation of students in basic
education programs, evaluation of students in
English-as-a-second-language education programs, other student
achievements, and students' reasons for leaving instructional
programs; (5) the numbers and type of staff and the hours and type of
staff development; (6) a self-analysis of program performance,
including features, accomplishments, and difficulties; and (7)
program expenditures. The section on the literacy services of the
public library provides information on services offered; amount of
instruction received by students; locations; print, audiovisual, and
computer materials; staff development; and expenditures. Fifty tables
appear in the narrative sections of the document. A one-page summary
and an appendix of summary data conclude the document. (CML)

NEW YORK CITY ADULT LITERACY INITIATIVE

FINAL REPORT

FOR

FISCAL YEAR 1986

███ LITERACY ASSISTANCE CENTER   **1987**

2

NEW YORK CITY ADULT LITERACY INITIATIVE

FINAL REPORT

FOR

FISCAL YEAR 1986

Prepared by: Literacy Assistance Center
15 Dutch Street, 4th Floor
New York, New York 10038

Dear Reader,

While the first year of the New York City Adult Literacy Initiative
was characterized by dramatic growth, the second year was a year of
increased stability. New sites were added to the core system of classes
and tutorial sessions provided at community based organizations, campuses
of the City University of New York, library branches, and sites of the
Board of Education. However, for the most part, start-up activities, such
as staffing and renovation were completed in the first year which allowed
for greater attention to instructional development, student needs, and
program refinement in the second.

This report on 1986 provides information on the number of literacy
programs, the type and quality of services provided, the number of people
served and some information on the impact of those services. The numbers
are impressive. Nearly 50,000 adults were served by programs of the New
York City Adult Literacy Initiative. However, the real nature of the
Initiative is seen when one looks beyond the numbers and sees the tens of
thousands of adults - workers, the unemployed, home owners, high school
drop-outs, immigrants, parents - all striving to develop their reading,
writing, math and English language skills. The New York City Adult
Literacy Initiative has built a remarkable system which can serve as a
model for other areas attempting to respond to the diverse needs of
learners and the complexity of a wide range of agencies providing literacy
services.

The many people involved in making this report possible are too
numerous to mention each by name. However, several people who shouldered
the responsibilities of data collection and verification, analysis,
writing and editing deserve special mention: Diane Harrington, Ruth
Chamberland, Delia Council, Joan Manes and Beverly Clement.

The teachers, and other program staff are at the heart of the
Initiative by providing the basic services, but they also collect and
report the information needed to understand the scope and the extent of
literacy activities in New York City.

The central staffs of ABE/HSE/ESL Services of the Board of Education,
the Office of Academic Affairs of the City University of New York, the
Community Development Agency, the Brooklyn Public Library, the New York
Public Library and the Queens Public Library have provided the overall
coordination of services within their systems. Their administrative and
programmatic support have strengthened the efforts of each literacy
program and contributed to the development of a strong city-wide system.

A description of the Initiative would not be complete without acknowledging the two people who have provided the primary leadership to it. Marian Schwarz, Coordinator of the New York City Mayor's Office of Youth Services, and Lois Matheson, Program Associate of the New York State Education Department, with the support of Garrett Murphy and Russell Kratz of the State Education Department, have maintained a steadfast commitment to expanding and improving literacy services so that they are available to New Yorkers throughout the city.

While the New York City Adult Literacy Initiative has supported an enormous expansion of literacy services, we're well aware that we are only beginning to respond to the demand and need for services. The strong foundation put in place during the first two years allows us to consider the possibility of continued expansion and the opportunity to examine and improve the quality of services, and moreover, enables us to face the challenges of the future.

Sincerely,

Jacqueline Cook
Executive Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

7

LIST OF TABLES

9

INTRODUCTION

Fiscal year 1986 (July 1, 1985 - June 30, 1986) marked the second year of the New York City Adult Literacy Initiative. This initiative represents a major investment by the City and State, in both financial and human resources, to expand and improve adult literacy services in New York City. It is supported by Municipal Assistance Corporation (MAC) funds administered by the City, and by federal Adult Education Act (AEA) funds and state aid to adult programs and Welfare Education Program (WEP) funds administered by the New York State Education Department. This report will provide data on the literacy programs operated throughout the City which are part of the Initiative.

Part I presents information on the students and staff participating in literacy programs operated by the New York City Board of Education, the City University of New York, and a variety of community based organizations. Part II describes the literacy services provided by the three public library systems, which are somewhat different from those provided by the other agencies. In addition to classes and tutorial services, the libraries have established broad collections of instructional and professional materials in adult education, available for use by other literacy programs as well as individuals.

The New York City Adult Literacy Initiative

The primary goal of the New York City Adult Literacy Initiative is to expand and improve adult literacy services throughout the City.

In Fiscal Year 1985, the City and State cooperated in coordinating new monies which were made available in that year with other resources already being used to support adult literacy services.

Since 1963 the New York State Education Department (SED) has been administering funds to support adult basic education services throughout the State. The State Legislature provided additional funds for adult basic education beginning in FY'85 when it passed the Employment Preparation Education (EPE) bill which provided monies to local education agencies providing literacy services. These monies were combined with federal funds provided by the Adult Education Act (AEA) and other funds supporting adult literacy, including the Welfare Education Program (WEP).

More than $1 billion in Municipal Assistance Corporation (MAC) surplus funds will be used by New York City over a four year period to enhance the City's economic development. A portion of these funds, $40 million, has been allocated to combat adult illiteracy. Of this $6 million was spent in fiscal year 1985; $8.3 million was spent in fiscal year 1986; $12 million was allocated for fiscal year 1987 and $13.5 million for fiscal year 1988. The MAC funds have provided for the expansion and improvement of literacy services as well as strong local control and coordination of resources.

10

For convenience, this combination of funds administered by the City and State and used for the New York City Adult Literacy Initiative will be referred to throughout this report as MAC/SED funds.

The need for this adult literacy initiative is acute. At least one million, and perhaps as many as one and one-half million, adults and older youth in New York City have limited literacy skills. Many of these individuals cannot find employment and cannot even enter most job training programs because they cannot read and write or speak English well enough to qualify. In fiscal year 1984, approximately 5,000 classroom places were available to these illiterate New Yorkers. The active waiting list included 12,000 names, and, according to a State survey, more than 50,000 people were turned away.

The new funds were provided to expand and improve the capacity of literacy programs to respond to this need. The City and State cooperated in developing funding guidelines and data collection procedures for MAC/SED-funded literacy programs and in setting overall goals for the New York City Adult Literacy Initiative. This cooperation must itself be recognized as an important step in strengthening adult literacy programs in the City.

Two types of instructional programs are eligible for funding: basic education (basic reading, writing, and math) and ESOL (English for speakers of other languages). A particular concern is to address the problems of those most in need of assistance. The guidelines call for at least 25% of all students served to be at the lowest reading levels (equivalent to grades 0-4.9), and at least 25% at the lowest level of English proficiency (ESOL levels I & II). In addition, the goal is to serve student populations of which 50% are unemployed.

The MAC/SED-funded adult literacy initiative aims to increase substantially the number of students who can be served in literacy programs providing basic education and ESOL services. It is also aimed at improving the quality of New York City's basic skills instruction in order to reduce adult illiteracy in future years.

The Data and the Reporting Procedures

The data summarized and discussed in this document were provided by programs in reports submitted during the year. All reports were sent directly to funders who sent copies of the reprots to the Literacy Assistance Center where data were compiled and summarized. Data are reported -- in aggregate on the classes, labs, and tutorial sessions provided by the programs of the City University of New York (CUNY), the community based organizations and the Board of Education. These data reported on students, and the type and extent of services. The public libraries reported on their services by submitting a final report which described: the literacy centers (the location, hours of operation, and equipment resources); the literacy collections (the quantity and type of materials); and the weekly use of the centers.

This report is being written and disseminated to provide a detailed summary of the FY 1986 literacy activities supported by the New York City Adult Literacy Initiative. While only aggregate data are available and reported here, individual student data have been collected and incorporated into a city-wide data base for research analysis. A separate report will be issued describing the research findings.

PART 1

SERVICES OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK, COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS, AND BOARD OF EDUCATION LITERACY PROGRAMS

I. PROVIDER AGENCIES

In fiscal year 1986, instruction in basic reading, writing, and mathematics and in English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) was offered by 10 colleges of the City University of New York (CUNY), 33 community-based organizations (CBOs), and 22 regions within the Board of Education (BOE) under MAC/SED funding. This represents slightly fewer programs for CUNY and CBOs as compared with FY 1985, when 11 CUNY colleges and 36 CBOs offered literacy instruction. For the Board of Education, a major new program, the Consortium for Worker Literacy (comprising 7 unions), was added in FY 1986.

These programs continued to offer great diversity in their services to the adults in various communities of New York City. They ranged from programs with fewer than 50 students in two or three classes to Board of Education regions with multiple sites serving over 2,000 students. The format of instruction also varied greatly. Tutorials, small group instruction, and labs (including computer-assisted instruction) were offered in addition to classroom instruction.

The most common type of instruction offered in these programs was English for speakers of other languages (ESOL); closely following that was basic education (BE). In addition, as in FY 1985, several programs offered instruction in mathematics or in basic education in a native language (BENL), usually Spanish or French. Many programs provided instruction in more than one area.

13

II. STUDENTS

A. Number of Students and Type of Instruction

The instructional programs described here served a total of 47,089 students in FY 1986, an increase of 6,993 over FY 1985. The number of students served by each provider agency in each type of instruction is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED BY PROVIDER AGENCY

	CUNY	CBOS	BOE	TOTAL
BE	4,915*	2,360	14,387	21,663
	22.77%	10.9%	66.4%	100%
ESOL	2,380	3,421	17,948	23,749
	10.0%	14.4%	75.6%	100%
BENL	123	216	785	1,124
	10.9%	19.2%	69.8%	100%
MATH	23	530	0	553
	4.2%	95.8%	0.0%	100%
TOTAL	7,442	6,527	33,120	47,089
	15.8%	13.9%	70.3%	100%

* Some of these CUNY students received instruction in Spanish. Since an exact number was not reported, they are included in this BE total.

As shown in Table 1, the Board of Education served 70% of the total students for FY 1986. The community-based organizations served about 14% of the total, while CUNY served about 16%. In FY 1985, the Board of Education served the same share of the total, about 70%. The CUNY colleges' share of the total increased from FY 1985, when they served just under 10%, while the CBOs' share decreased from FY 1985, when they served about 18% of the total number of students.

The Board of Education served more than two-thirds of the total students in both BE and ESOL. In actual numbers, however, the Board served 1,655 fewer students in BE than in FY 1985, and 5,595 more students in ESOL. CUNY served a proportionally higher number of BE students. Students in BENL were served in proportionately higher numbers by CBOs, which also served the vast majority of students in separate math instruction. Many basic education classes at all agencies included math instruction as part of their curriculum.

Using the same data presented in Table 1, Table 2 presents a breakdown of students by type of instruction.

TABLE 2
NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTION

	BE	ESOL	BENL	MATH	TOTAL
CUNY	4,916	2,380	123	23	7,442
	66.0%	32.0%	1.7%	0.3%	100%
CBOS	2,360	3,421	216	530	6,527
	36.2%	52.4%	3.3%	8.1%	100%
BOE	14,387	17,948	785	0	33,120
	43.4%	54.2%	2.4%	--	100%
TOTAL	21,663	23,749	1,124	553	47,089
	46.0%	50.4%	2.4%	1.2%	100%

Table 2 illustrates that slightly more than half of all students, 50.4%, were enrolled in ESOL instruction, as compared with 46% in BE instruction. Again, this is a reversal of percentages from FY 1985, when 51.6% of the students were enrolled in BE, and 44.5% were enrolled in ESOL. All provider agencies except CUNY served substantially more students in ESOL than in BE.

In addition to the numbers given here, the provider agencies served 6,324 students reading at grade levels 9 through 12 in basic education classes. CUNY served 2,845 such students, CBOs served 73, and the Board of Education served 3,406. Since city MAC funds only supported BE services for levels 0-8.9, these higher level students are excluded from this report.

In FY 1986, a significant change was made in the system for providing services to pre-GED and GED students. Prior to FY 1986, GED services were provided through the Board of Education. While services were located at CBOs and CUNY campuses throughout the city and in the case of CUNY the GED program was coordinated through its central office, all GED students and therefore instructional and contact hours, were reported through the BOE. In FY 1986 a new model was created which provided for a transition of some of these services from the BOE to CUNY. The increased FY '86 number at the BE upper levels for CUNY and the decrease for BOE and the change in the proportion of BE vs. ESOL students served reflect the implementation of this change. This change in service providers also significantly explains the shift in the proportion of total students being served by each literacy provider agency.

Being the first year in this transition of services, CUNY data
collection and reporting procedures were not solidified. Therefore,
differences existed in the type of information reported. The 2,923 CUNY
pre-GED students 8-8.9 are included in the total presented in this section
but, except where specifically noted, are not included in the sections
which follow.

B. Instructional Level of Students*

A major goal of the MAC/SED literacy funding is to address the needs
of adults functioning at the lowest reading levels and/or having the least
proficiency in English. For this reason, the funding guidelines specify
that at least 25% of the students served be reading at grade levels 0-4.9
and that at least another 25% be at the beginning ESOL levels (I/II).
This goal was difficult to attain for basic education students, as it was
in FY 1985, according to program managers, who stated that beginning or
very poor readers were the most difficult group to recruit and to retain.
During FY 1986 for readers at levels 0-4.9 represented only 13.1% of the
total student population, exactly the same percentage as in FY 1985. It
must be recognized, however, that BE students as a whole represent
substantially less than half the total student population (42.4%, as seen
in Table 2). The 5,794 students served in the lower instructional levels
of BE represent 30.9% of the total number of BE students, which is a
substantial increase from FY 1985 when only 25.3% of the BE population
were in levels 0-4.9. ESOL students at levels I/II, on the other hand,
represented 38.9% of the total student population, an increase from 33.6%
in FY 1985. All three provider agencies were successful in recruiting
beginning level ESOL students.

TABLE 3
NUMBER OF BE AND ESOL STUDENTS AT LOWER INSTRUCTIONAL LEVELS

	BE Levels 0-4.9	% BE Pop	% Total Pop	ESOL Levels I/II	% ESOL Pop	% Total Pop
CUNY	942	47.3%	20.8%	1,865	78.4%	41.3%
CBOS	1,234	52.3%	18.9%	2,755	80.5%	42.2%
BOE	3,618	25.2%	10.9%	12,575	70.1%	38.0%
TOTAL	5,794	30.9%	13.1%	17,195	72.4%	38.9%

*For the following sections of this report CUNY student numbers and
calculations are for 1,993 BE students and 4,519 total students.

C. Basic Education

Of the of 18,740 students enrolled in Basic Education instruction. Of these, 2,313 (12.3%) were at the very lowest level (0-2.9), while 3,481 (18.6%) were at level 3-4.9. As noted above, students functioning at these combined levels represented 30.9% of the basic education population, an increase from FY 1985 when the lower levels represented 25.3% of the basic education population. This increase reflects an increase in lower level students served by the Board of Education; in FY 1986, 25.2% of the Board's BE students were at the lower instructional levels as compared with 17.6% in FY 1985. Both CUNY and the CBOs continued to serve about half of their BE students in the lower levels.

TABLE 4
NUMBER OF BASIC EDUCATION STUDENTS BY INSTRUCTIONAL LEVEL

	LEVEL 0-2.9	LEVEL 3-4.9	SUBTOTAL 0-4.9	LEVEL 5-6.9	LEVEL 7-8.9	SUBTOTAL 5-8.9	TOTAL
CUNY	429 21.5%	513 25.7%	942 47.3%	780 39.1%	271 13.6%	1,051 52.7%	1,993 100%
CBOS	653 27.7%	581 24.6%	1,234 52.3%	722 30.6%	404 17.1%	1,128 47.7%	2,360 100%
BOE	1,231 8.6%	2,387 16.6%	3,618 25.2%	4,787 33.3%	5,982 41.6%	10,769 74.9%	14,387 100%
TOTAL	2,313 12.3%	3,481 18.6%	5,794 30.9%	6,289 33.6%	6,657 35.5%	12,946 69.1%	18,740 100%

D. ESOL

Table 5 demonstrates that the literacy programs have been uniformly successful in recruiting students performing at the lower levels among this population. In fact, over 70% of each agency's ESOL population was functioning at the combined lower levels, and close to half at the very lowest level.

TABLE 5
NUMBER OF ESOL STUDENTS BY INSTRUCTIONAL LEVEL

	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	SUBTOTAL I/II	LEVEL III	LEVEL IV	SUBTOTAL III/IV	TOTAL
CUNY	1,130	735	1,865	361	154	515	2,380
	47.5%	30.9%	78.4%	15.2%	6.5%	21.6%	100%
CBOS	1,802	953	2,755	505	161	666	,421
	52.7%	27.9%	80.5%	14.8%	4.7%	19.5%	100%
BOE	8,734	3,841	12,575	3,560	1,813	5,373	17,948
	48.7%	21.4%	70.1%	19.8%	10.1%	29.9%	100%
TOTAL	11,666	5,529	17,195	4,426	2,128	6,554	23,749
	49.1%	23.3%	72.4%	18.6%	9.0%	27.6%	100%

E. Race/Ethnicity*

The student population was broken down by race or ethnicity into five categories: Native American, Asian, Black, Hispanic, and White/Other. Table 6 demonstrates that, as in FY 1985, the vast majority of students were non-white: 90.0% of the total student population, 91% of CUNY's population, 83.5% of the CBOs' population, and 92.1% of the Board of Education's population. Nearly half of the total population was Hispanic, and nearly one third was Black.

* The data presented for Race/Ethnicity, Gender, Age, Employment Status, and Other Characteristics were all self-reported by students. Since not all students were willing to report personal information, and since some students were enrolled in more than one type of instruction (e.g. basic education and math), the total number of students reported in these categories does not match the total number of students served by programs. (Percentages shown are based on total reporting in each category.)

TABLE 6
NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY RACE/ETHNICITY

	NATIVE AMERICAN	ASIAN	BLACK	HISPANIC	WHITE/ OTHER	TOTAL
CUNY	19 0.4%	367 7.9%	1,566 33.6%	2,289 49.1%	422 9.0%	4,663 100%
CBOS	6 0.1%	627 11.2%	1,780 31.9%	2,247 40.3%	920 16.5%	5,580 100%
BOE	131 0.4%	3,690 11.1%	10,182 30.6%	16,598 49.9%	2,633 7.9%	33,234 100%
TOTAL	156 0.4%	4,684 10.8%	13,528 31.1%	21,134 48.6%	3,975 9.1%	43,477 100%

F. Gender and Age

Students were also categorized by gender. Table 7 reveals that, like the previous year, considerably more females than males were served by the literacy programs. In FY 1986, 60.4% of the students were female, approximately the same as in FY 1985 when 59.0% of the students were female.

TABLE 7
NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY GENDER

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
CUNY	1,887 40.2%	2,806 59.8%	4,693 100%
CBOS	2,432 42.7%	3,270 57.3%	5,702 100%
BOE	13,037 39.0%	20,411 61.0%	33,448 100%
TOTAL	17,356 39.6%	26,487 60.4%	43,843 100%

In addition, students were grouped by age: 16-20 years, 21-24 years, 25-44 years, 45-59 years, and over 60 years. As shown in Table 8, students in the group 25-44 years represented over half of the total number of students. This was also true in FY 1985, when 51.7% of the students were in this group.

TABLE 8
NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY AGE

	16-20	21-24	25-44	45-59	60+	TOTAL
CUNY	454	803	2,661	656	119	4,693
	9.7%	17.1%	56.7%	14.0%	2.5%	100%
CBOS	887	880	2,885	775	272	5,702
	15.6%	15.4%	50.6%	13.6%	4.8%	100%
BOE	4,733	5,471	17,981	4,392	871	33,448
	14.2%	16.4%	53.8%	13.1%	2.6%	100%
TOTAL	6,074	7,154	23,527	5,826	1,262	43,843
	13.9%	16.3%	53.7%	13.3%	2.9%	100%

Tables 9 and 10 present the number of male and female students by age groupings. For both male and female, the largest age grouping was 25-44 years, but there was nonetheless a tendency for males entering literacy programs to be younger than females. More than 30% of all males were under 25, while only 23% of females were under 25. In addition, substantially more females than males were in the 25-44 and 45-59 age groupings. These patterns were consistent for all agencies and continue a trend from FY 1985.

TABLE 9
NUMBER OF MALE STUDENTS BY AGE

	16-20	21-24	25-44	45-59	60+	TOTAL
CUNY	209	368	1,037	236	37	1,887
	11.1%	19.5%	55.0%	12.5%	2.0%	100%
CBOS	467	388	1,199	288	90	2,432
	19.2%	16.0%	49.3%	11.8%	3.7%	100%
BOE	2,275	2,446	6,758	1,280	278	13,037
	17.5%	18.8%	51.8%	9.8%	2.1%	100%
TOTAL	2,951	3,202	8,994	1,804	405	17,356
	17.0%	18.4%	51.8%	10.4%	2.3%	100%

TABLE 10
NUMBER OF FEMALE STUDENTS BY AGE

	16-20	21-24	25-44	45-59	60+	TOTAL
CUNY	245	435	1,624	420	82	2,806
	8.7%	15.5%	57.9%	15.0%	2.9%	100%
CBOS	420	492	1,686	490	182	3,270
	12.8%	15.0%	51.6%	15.0%	5.6%	100%
BOE	2,458	3,025	11,223	3,112	593	20,411
	12.0%	14.8%	54.9%	15.2%	2.9%	100%
TOTAL	3,123	3,952	14,533	4,022	857	26,487
	11.8%	14.9%	54.9%	15.2%	3.2%	100%

G. Employment Status

In order to address the educational needs of the populations most in need of assistance, MAC/SED funding guidelines specified that at least 50% of the student population city-wide be unemployed adults. As shown in Table 11, this goal was achieved: 51.1% of the students were unemployed (whether available for work or not). This represents a slight drop from FY 1985, when 55% of the students served were unemployed.

TABLE 11
NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED/ AVAILABLE	UNEMPLOYED/ NOT AVAILABLE
CUNY	2,010	1,448	646
	49.0%	35.3%	15.7%
CBOS	1,992	2,543	1,229
	34.6%	44.1%	21.3%
BOE	18,988	10,661	7,452
	51.2%	28.7%	20.1%
TOTAL	22,990	14,652	9,327
	48.9%	31.2%	19.9%

H. Other Characteristics

Further information was collected about students participating in instructional programs, as presented in Table 12. Since students may fall into more than one category, no totals by agency are presented. Percentages given are percent of total population served.

TABLE 12
NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY CHARACTERISTICS

	RECEIVE P.A.	HANDI- CAPPED	IMMI- GRANT	MIGRANT	INSTITU- TION
CUNY	7.6 15.2%	198 4.2%	2,050 43.4%	155 3.3%	2 .0%
CBOS	1,596 28.3%	357 6.3%	3,263 58.0%	74 1.3%	266 4.7%
BOE	6,031 18.1%	1,878 5.7%	18,150 54.6%	514 1.5%	884 2.7%
TOTAL	8,353 19.1%	2,433 5.6%	23,463 53.8%	743 1.7%	1,152 2.6%

III. AMOUNT OF INSTRUCTION RECEIVED BY STUDENTS

The amount of instruction offered by programs or received by students was measured in various ways. The first of these is the number of instructional hours, which are the hours of instruction offered by programs. A three-hour session, for example, represents three instructional hours. The second measure of instruction is contact hours, which are the number of hours of instruction students actually received. This is calculated for each class by multiplying the instructional hours by the number of students attending. Thus, a three-hour session attended by 15 students represents 45 contact hours, while a three-hour session attended by 12 students represents 36 contact hours. Each instructional program calculated and reported its own instructional and contact hours.

A th'rd measure of the amount of instruction is the average number of contact hours per student, calculated by dividing the total number of contact hours by the total number of students. This can be used to approximate the intensity of instruction or the average length of time students received instruction.

The fourth measure of the instruction is the average number of students attending each class session, derived by dividing contact hours by instructional hours.

A. Instructional Hours

A total of 355,815 hours of instruction was reported by the programs, an increase of 73,353 hours from FY 1985. This included 10,673 testing hours (3% of the total) and 345,142 instructional hours. The latter is an increase of 71,813 hours from FY 1985. Table 13 breaks down the instructional hours (excluding testing hours) by type of instruction.

It is interesting to note that the percentages of instructional hours for BE and ESOL differ from the percentages of students enrolled in those areas: 42.4% of the students were enrolled in BE and received 52.3% of the instructional hours; and 53.8% of the students were in ESOL and received 44.7% of the instructional hours. For BENL and math, these percentages were fairly consistent: 2.5% of the students were in BENL and received 2.3% of the instructional hours; and 1.3% of the students were in math and received 0.7% of the instructional hours. A partial explanation for the discrepancies in BE and ESOL is that the instruction for BE students was provided through tutorials, small groups and smaller classes at lower levels to allow programs to better serve this difficult population.

TABLE 13
NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL HOURS BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTION

	BE	ESOL	BENL	MATH	TOTAL
CUNY	21,201	15,126	1,165	78	37,570
	56.4%	40.3%	3.1%	0.2%	100%
CBOS	32,933	25,534	2,225	2,426	63,118
	52.2%	40.5%	3.5%	3.8%	100%
BOE	126,289	113,623	4,542	0	244,454
	51.7%	46.5%	1.9%	—	100%
TOTAL	180,423	154,283	7,932	2,504	345,142
	52.3%	44.7%	2.3%	0.7%	100%

The greatest number of instructional hours was offered in basic education: a total of 180,423, which represents an increase of 28,972 over FY 1985. Of this total, 86,248 hours (47.8%) were offered at the lower instructional levels (0-4.9), while 94,175 (52.2%) were offered at the higher levels. Table 14 presents the basic education instructional hours by instructional levels.

TABLE 14
NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL HOURS FOR BASIC EDUCATION BY LEVEL

	LEVEL 0-4.9	LEVEL 5-8.9	TOTAL
CUNY	11,901	9,300	21,201
	56.1%	43.9%	100%
CBOS	24,195	8,738	32,933
	73.5%	26.5%	100%
BOE	50,152	76,137	126,289
	39.7%	60.3%	100%
TOTAL	86,248	94,175	180,423
	47.8%	52.2%	100%

A comparison of the proportions of basic education students at the different instructional levels (Table 4) with the basic education instructional hours at those levels (Table 14) reveals an interesting pattern. Overall, 30.9% of the basic education students were at levels 0-4.9 and received 47.8% of the basic education instructional hours. At

CUNY, 47.3% of the basic education students were at the lower levels and received 56.1% of the basic education instructional hours. At the CBOs, 52.3% of the BE students received 73.5% of the BE instructional hours, and at the BOE 25.2% of the BE students received 39.7% of the BE instructional hours. This pattern was also found in FY 1985, and is due, at least in part, to the funding requirement that lower level basic education classes be smaller (8-14 students) than classes of other types and levels (10-20), reflecting a need for more intensiv instruction at this level. Then, a smaller class size for levels 0-4.9 would result in a higher proportion of hours when compared to students.

The total number of instructional hours for ESOL was 154,283, an increase of 47,116 from FY 1985. Of this total, 106,008 hours (68.7%) were at instructional levels I/II, while 48,275 hours (31.3%) were at the higher instructional levels, as shown in Table 15.

TABLE 15
NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL HOURS FOR ESOL BY LEVEL

	LEVEL I/II	LEVEL III/IV	TOTAL
CUNY	10,695 70.7%	4,431 29.3%	15,126 100%
CBOS	18,645 73.0%	6,889 27.0%	25,534 100%
BOE	76,668 67.5%	36,955 32.5%	113,623 100%
TOTAL	106,008 68.7%	48,275 31.3%	154,283 100%

When the figures in Table 15 are compared with ESOL student data in Table 5, it can be seen that, for all programs, the proportions of ESOL instructional hours are fairly consistent with the proportions of students enrolled at those levels. This would be expected since there were no differences in the requirements for class size for various ESOL levels. A minimum of 10 and a maximum of 20 students was required for all ESOL classes. Interestingly, the lower level students received slightly smaller proportions of instructional hours in all programs than their proportions of the student enrollment. Overall, 72.4% of the ESOL students were enrolled in levels I/II and received 68.7% of the ESOL instructional hours. At CUNY, 78.4% of the ESOL students received 70.7% of the ESOL instructional hours; at the CBOs, 80.5% of the ESCL students received 73.0% of the ESOL instructional hours; and at the BOE, 70.1% of the ESOL students received 67.5% of the ESOL instructional hours. This pattern was also found in FY 1985.

B. Contact Hours

A total of 3,864,567 contact hours was reported by the instructional programs, an increase of 713,596 contact hours over FY 1985%. Of this total, 3,814,368 hours were for instruction, and 50,199 were for testing. Table 16 presents the contact hours (excluding testing contact hours) by type of instruction.

TABLE 16
NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTION

	BE	ESOL	BENL	MATH	TOTAL
CUNY	223,594 46.6%	238,319 49.7%	16,636 3.5%	1,206 0.3%	479,755 100%
CBOS	211,608 31.3%	414,021 61.3%	27,193 4.0%	22,928 3.4%	675,750 100%
BOE	1,168,095 43.9%	1,461,440 55.0%	29,328 1.1%	0 —	2,658,863 100%
TOTAL	1,603,297 42.0%	2,113,780 55.4%	73,157 1.9%	24,134 0.6%	3,814,368 100%

The proportions of contact hours for each type of instruction (Table 16) is fairly consistent with the proportions of students enrolled: overall, 42.4% of the students were enrolled in BE and generated 42.0% of the contact hours; 53.8% of the students were enrolled in ESOL and generated 55.4% of the contact hours; 2.5% of the students were enrolled in math and generated 1.9% of the contact hours; and 1.3% of the students were enrolled in BENL and generated 0.6% of the contact hours. This consistency was not found for instructional hours in BE and ESOL; nor was it true in FY 1985.

A total of 1,603,297 contact hours was provided in basic education. Of this, 655,946 contact hours (40.9% of the basic education contact hours) were provided at the lower levels, and 947,351 contact hours (59.1%) at the higher levels. Comparing these figures, presented in Table 17, with the BE student data presented in Table 4 reveals a consistent pattern across agencies of lower level students generating a comparatively higher number of contact hours. At CUNY, 47.3% of the BE students generated 52.8% of the BE contact hours; at the CBOs, 52.3% of the BE students generated 61.4% of the BE contact hours; and at the BOE, 25.2% of the BE students generated 34.9% of the BE contact hours.

TABLE 17
NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS FOR BASIC EDUCATION BY LEVEL

	LEVEL 0-4.9	LEVEL 5-8.9	TOTAL
CUNY	118,167 52.8%	105,427 47.2%	223,594 100%
CBOS	129,862 61.4%	81,746 38.6%	211,608 100%
BOE	407,917 34.9%	760,178 65.1%	1,168,095 100%
TOTAL	655,946 40.9%	947,351 59.1%	1,603,297 100%

Table 18 presents the ESOL contact hours: a total of 2,113,780 contact hours, an increase of 512,250 contact hours over FY 1985 which represents a 32% increase. When these data are compared with ESOL student data (Table 5), it can be seen that the proportions of students enrolled at each level are fairly consistent with the proportions of contact hours for those levels: overall, 72.4% of the ESOL students were at levels I/II and generated 70.2% of the ESOL contact hours. At CUNY, 78.4% of the ESOL students generated 76.1% of the ESOL contact hours; at the CBOs, 80.5% of the ESOL students generated 79.0% of the ESOL contact hours; and at the BOE, 70.1% of the ESOL students generated 66.8% of the ESOL contact hours. This consistency was also found in FY 1985.

TABLE 18
NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS FOR ESOL BY LEVEL

	LEVEL I/II	LEVEL III/IV	TOTAL
CUNY	181,442 76.1%	56,877 23.9%	238,319 100%
CBOS	327,080 79.0%	86,941 21.0%	414,021 100%
BOE	976,315 66.8%	485,125 33.2%	1,461,440 100%
TOTAL	1,484,837 70.2%	628,943 29.8%	2,113,780 100%

C. Contact Hours per Student

The attendance of students enrolled in adult literacy programs varies widely. Students may enroll at any point within a fiscal year; hours of instruction very by program; enrollees may interrupt their studies due to any one of a myriad of personal factors. As a result, the number of contact hours per student within a single fiscal year can range from a very few to over 200. A student may continue to attend for as long as they want or need to, crossing fiscal years. This report does not track cumulative hours per student across fiscal years.

The average number of contact hours per student for all programs was 80, as compared with 76 in FY 1985. For CUNY, it was the highest, 106 (as compared with 92 in FY 1985); for the CBOs, it was 102 (as compared with 86 in FY 1985); and for the BOE, it was 73 (as compared with 72 in FY 1985).

These numbers can be used to approximate the intensity of instruction or the average length of time students received instruction. Although the actual number of sessions or weeks of attendance per student depends upon the schedule of each program, for a typical schedule of two three-hour sessions a week, an average of 80 contact hours per student would mean 26.6 sessions or 13.3 weeks of instruction.

The average number of contact hours per student was highest for ESOL students: 89. For BE, the average was 86; for BENL, it was 65; and for math, 44. It is interesting to note that for BE 0-4.9 students, the average number of contact hours was 113, which greatly exceeded the BE average of 86.

D. Average Number of Students Attending Each Session

The average attendance per session for all programs, derived by dividing contact hours by instructional hours, was 11, the same as in FY 1985. For CUNY, the average attendance was 13; for the CBOs, it was 11; and for the BOE, it was 11. The average attendance of 14 for ESOL was the highest; for BE, it was 9; for BENL, it was 9; and for math, it was 10. It must be noted that these figures do not indicate attendance rates, since they cannot be compared with the number of students enrolled.

TABLE 19
ATTENDANCE BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTION

	BE	ESOL	BENL	MATH	AVERAGE
CUNY	11	16	14	15	13
CBOS	6	16	12	9	11
BOE	9	13	6	—	11
AVERAGE	9	14	9	10	11

Table 20 presents the attendance numbers for basic education by instructional level. The smallest numbers were at the lower levels, most likely reflecting the smaller classes at these levels. In fact, MAC/SED funding guidelines require smaller classes for lower basic education students: an average daily attendance of 8-12 at level 0-2.9, of 10-14 at level 3-4.9, and 10-20 at higher levels. The average number of BE students attending each session in CBOs is lower than the other LPAs due to the inclusion of individual or special small group tutoring sessions in the totals.

TABLE 20
BASIC EDUCATION ATTENDANCE BY LEVEL

	LEVEL 0-4.9	LEVEL 5-8.9	AVERAGE
CUNY	10	11	11
CBOS	5	9	6
BOE	8	10	9
AVERAGE	8	10	9

Table 21 presents ESOL attendance by instructional level. In general, classes at the lower instructional levels (I/II) had slightly higher attendance numbers than classes at the higher levels. This was true at CUNY and at the CBOs; the Board of Education, on the other hand, had equal attendance numbers at both levels. Once again, it is most likely that these numbers reflect the size of classes rather than rates of attendance.

TABLE 21
ESOL ATTENDANCE BY LEVEL

	LEVEL I/II	LEVEL III/IV	AVERAGE
CUNY	17	13	16
CBOS	18	13	16
BOE	13	13	13
AVERAGE	14	13	14

IV. STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

Results obtained through regular testing provide one measure of
student achievement. All students who received literacy instruction were
tested upon entering the programs. Basic education instructional levels
were established using the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). For
non-English speakers, the John Test was used.

It is important to recognize that the test used to measure achievement
in basic education, the TABE, was not designed to measure the very lowest
level (0-2.9). Furthermore, the test used to measure growth in ESOL, the
John Test, was not designed as a standardized achievement test, and test
norms, reliability, and validity have not been established. The results
reported here should be viewed in that light and conclusions seen as
evidence of possible trends.

A. Students with Post-Tests

Out of the total student population of 44,166, the total number of
students post-tested was 21,881 or 49.5% of the students. This represents
an increase from FY 1985 when 42.7% of the students were post-tested.
Many students were not post-tested because they had not received enough
hours of instruction according to MAC/SED guidelines. These guidelines
specify that students in a tutorial program should be post-tested after 50
hours of instruction; students whose classes meet less than 10 hours per
week should be post-tested after 100 hours; and students whose classes
meet 10 or more hours per week after 200 hours. Since students enter
programs at various times during the year, not all of them had received
the specified number of hours of instruction by the end of the fiscal
year. Certainly some students left the programs prior to receiving
post-tests. Table 22 presents the number of students with post-tests by
type of instruction.

TABLE 22
STUDENTS WITH POST-TESTS BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTION

	BE	ESOL	BENL	MATH	TOTAL
CUNY	1,313	1,507	100	19	2,939
% total	65.9%	63.3%	81.3%	82.6%	65.0%
CBOS	1,172	2,385	161	279	3,997
%total	49.7%	69.7%	74.5%	52.6%	61.2%
BOE	6,017	8,620	308	—	14,945
%total	41.8%	48.0%	39.2%	—	45.1%
TOTAL	8,502	12,512	569	298	21,881
%total	45.4%	52.7%	50.6%	53.9%	49.5%

By agency, CUNY post-tested the highest percentage of students, 65.0%, followed closely by the CBOs, where 61.2% of the students were post-tested. In FY 1985, CUNY post-tested 56.1% of the students, and the CBOs post-tested 66.3% of the students. The Board of Education post-tested 45.1% of the students, an increase from 35.1% in FY 1985. Undoubtedly, some of this increase is a result of a change in BOE procedure: in FY 1985 the BOE used a GED prediction exam for testing HSE students instead of the TABE test. In FY 1986 the BOE began pre and post testing all HSE students 7-8.9 using the TABE test.

B. Students with Gain

As a result of participating in literacy programs, a total of 8,078 students showed a gain of at least one year on the tests used for BE, BENL, or math or 20 points on the John Test, used for ESOL. These students represent 18.3% of the total student population and 36.9% of the students with post-tests. In FY 1985, students with gain represented a slightly smaller percentage of the total student population (17.5%) and a larger percentage of students post-tested (41.0%). The latter difference is not surprising, since a larger percentage of the total student population was post-tested in FY 1986 (49.5% as compared with 42.8%). It must also be remembered that many other students made significant progress, but because they were not post-tested or showed somewhat less than one year of growth or 20 points of gain, they are not included here. Table 23 presents the number of students with gain by type of instruction. Totals are not presented for each agency since the types of tests and indicators for reporting gain differ by type of instruction.

*NOTE: There are more students with less than one year or 20 points of gain but those data were not included in this data source. For more detailed gain information see "Analysis of New York Ctiy's Adult Literacy Data: 1985-1986".

TABLE 23
NUMBER OF STUDENTS WITH GAIN BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTION

	BE	ESOL	BENL	MATH
CUNY	710	799	71	19
% post-tested	54.1%	53.0%	71.0%	100.0%
% total	35.6%	33.6%	57.7%	82.6%
CBOS	673	1,121	99	155
% post-tested	57.4%	47.0%	61.5%	55.6%
% total	28.5%	32.8%	45.8%	29.2%
BOE	2,323	2,108	0	0
% post-tested	38.6%	24.5%	0.0%	—
% total	16.1%	11.7%	0.0%	—
TOTAL	3,706	4,028	170	174
% post-tested	43.6%	32.2%	29.9%	58.4%
% total	19.8%	17.0%	15.1%	31.5%

As shown in Table 23, math had the highest percentage of students with gain, both out of those with post-tests (58.4%) and out of the total population enrolled in math (31.5%). This was also true in FY 1985, when 68.9% of the math students with post-tests and 55.8% of the total math population showed gain. Among BE students, 43.6% of those with post-tests and 19.8% of the total BE student population showed gain; this represents a substantial improvement from FY 1985, when 43.8% of students with post-tests and 12.2% of the total BE population showed gain. Among ESOL students, 32.2% of the students with post-tests and 17.0% of the ESOL population showed gain; this represents a decrease from FY 1985, when 38.0% of the students with post-tests and 22.7% of the ESOL population showed gain. Among BENL students, 29.9% of the students with post-tests and 15.1% of the BENL population showed gain; in FY 1985, a substantially larger proportion (56.1%) of BENL students with post-tests showed gain, but this represents the same proportion (15.1%) of the total BENL population.

C. Basic Education

Table 24 presents data on basic education students showing gain. Overall, 19.6% of the BE students showed gain, a substantial increase from FY 1985, when 12.2% of the BE students showed gain. It is an encouraging sign that higher proportions of lower level students showed gain in comparison with higher level students: overall, 48.3% of lower level students with post-tests and 24.3% of the total lower level BE students showed gain in comparison with 41.1% of higher level students with post-tests and 17.8% of the total higher level BE students. This trend was also true in FY 1985.

TABLE 24
STUDENT GAIN IN BASIC EDUCATION BY LEVEL

	LEVEL 0-2.9	LEVEL 3-4.9	SUBTOTAL 0-4.9	LEVEL 5-6.9	LEVEL 7-8.9	SUBTOTAL 5-8.9	TOTAL
CUNY	106	175	281	298	131	429	710
%test	44.4%	51.3%	48.4%	51.9%	82.4%	58.5%	54.1%
%total	24.7%	34.1%	29.8%	38.2%	48.3%	40.8%	35.6%
CBOS	155	180	335	220	118	338	673
%test	45.7%	64.5%	54.2%	62.7%	58.1%	61.0%	57.4%
%total	23.7%	31.0%	27.1%	30.5%	29.2%	30.0%	28.5%
BOE	238	554	792	820	711	1,531	2,323
%test	41.0%	48.8%	46.2%	39.7%	31.8%	35.6%	38.6%
%total	19.3%	23.2%	21.9%	17.1%	11.9%	14.2%	16.1%
TOTAL	499	909	1,408	1,338	960	2,298	3,706
%test	43.1%	51.8%	48.3%	44.8%	36.9%	41.1%	43.6%
%total	21.6%	26.1%	24.3%	21.3%	14.4%	17.8%	19.8%

D. ESOL

Overall, 4,028 ESOL students (17.0%) showed gain, a slight decrease from FY 1985, when 4,051 students (22.7%) showed gain. The proportion of students post-tested with gain, 32.2%, was also lower than in FY 1985, when 38.0% of the ESOL students with post-tests showed gain. Overall, more students at the lower ESOL level showed gain than students at the higher level; by agency, this pattern was consistent, as it also was in FY 1985. At CUNY, 38.9% of the lower level ESOL students showed gain, while 14.4% of the higher level students showed gain; at the CBOs, 36.0% of the lower level students showed gain as compared with 19.4% of the higher level students; and at the BOE, 14.6% of the lower level students showed gain as compared with 5.2% of the higher level students. Table 25 presents the number of ESOL students with gain by instructional level.

TABLE 25
STUDENT GAIN IN ESOL INSTRUCTION BY LEVEL

	LEVEL I	LEVEL II	SUBTOTAL I/II	LEVEL III	LEVEL IV	SUBTOTAL III/IV	TOTAL
CUNY	371	354	725	69	5	74	799
%test	53.6%	65.7%	58.9%	32.7%	7.7%	26.8%	53.0%
%total	32.8%	48.2%	38.9%	19.1%	3.2%	14.4%	33.6%
CBOS	644	348	922	109	20	129	1,121
%test	52.1%	49.7%	51.3%	31.2%	19.8%	28.7%	47.0%
%total	35.7%	36.5%	36.0%	21.6%	12.4%	19.4%	32.8%
BOE	1,260	570	1,830	262	16	278	2,108
%test	33.1%	30.8%	32.4%	13.7%	1.5%	9.4%	24.5%
%total	14.4%	14.8%	14.6%	7.4%	0.9%	5.2%	11.7%
TOTAL	2,275	1,272	3,547	440	41	481	4,029
%test	39.7%	41.2%	40.2%	17.8%	3.4%	13.0%	32.2%
%total	19.5%	23.0%	20.6%	9.9%	1.9%	7.3%	17.0%

E. Other Achieveme... by Students*

Many students made other types of achievements as a result of participating in instructional programs, as presented in Table 26. It should be noted that an individual student could fall into more than one category of achievement, so neither grand totals nor totals by agency are given. The only totals presented are the number of students for each category. Large numbers of students were judged by the programs to have increased their skills or competencies in general areas of knowledge. Among the more specific types of achievement, the greatest number of students obtained a General Equivalency Diploma (2,301), although this represents a drop from FY 1985, when 4,361 students obtained a GED. Relativ ' large numbers of students also obtained a job or registered to vote.

* In this section of the report and in the following section, Students' Reasons for Leaving Instructional Programs, 3,502 students at reading levels 9-12 are included: 23 at CUNY, 73 at the CBOs, and 3,406 at the Board of Education.

TABLE 26
NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY TYPE OF ACHIEVEMENT

	CUNY	CBOs	BOE	TOTAL
Improved Skills	3,404	4,870	17,878	26,152
Improved Comp.				
Comm. Res.	2,577	3,669	7,360	13,606
Government	1,883	2,912	6,096	10,891
Consumer	1,549	3,130	5,183	9,862
Occup. Know.	1,672	3,331	4,285	9,288
Health Care	1,701	3,034	2,603	7,338
Parenting	1,553	2,552	1,605	5,710
Other	720	3,060	2,592	6,372
Obtained GED	2,311*	136	2,116	4,563
Obtained Job	137	547	702	1,386
Register Vote	247	475	166	898
Completed BE	229	222	399	850
Enter Other Ed.	52	332	374	758
Obt. Better Job	36	228	447	731
Completed ESOL 4	50	179	172	401
Remove P.A.	21	263	95	379
Enter Post.Sec.	26	114	183	323
US Citizenship	15	41	69	125
Obtained Diploma	C	28	55	83

* Includes data on 5,745 CUNY pre-GED and GED students.

F. Students' Reasons for Leaving Instructional Programs

Whenever students left instructional programs during the year, they were asked to give their reasons for leaving. The data collected on these reasons are given in Table 27. The most common reasons given were having obtained a job, enrolling in other education, and having moved.

TABLE 27
NUMBER OF STUDENTS BY REASONS FOR LEAVING PROGRAMS

	CUNY	CBOs	BOE	TOTAL
Obtained Job	91	389	977	1,457
Other Education	116	222	766	1,104
Changed Address	208	310	508	1,026
Family	159	231	532	922
Health	150	195	529	874
Child Care	109	107	274	490
Other Training	21	134	239	394
Time of Class	52	54	278	384
Lack of Interest	48	121	195	364
Transportation	59	34	112	205
Location	14	14	55	83
Other Known	389	116	2,104	2,609
Other Unknown	961	464	3,041	4,466

V. STAFF

A. Number and Type of Staff

Staffing patterns varied greatly among instructional programs, as they also did in FY 1985. Presented in Tables 28-31 are the numbers of 1) administrators & supervisors, 2) teachers, 3) counselors, and 4) paraprofessionals, each according to the number of hours worked per week. In these four tables, the Board of Education staffing information is given for regions 1-13. Only information on teachers was available for the other regions. In addition, in Table 32, the number of unpaid volunteers are presented for programs, data that were not available in FY 1985.

TABLE 28
NUMBER OF ADMINISTRATORS AND SUPERVISORS BY HOURS WORKED PER WEEK

	LESS THAN 20 HOURS	20-35 HOURS	35 HOURS	TOTAL
CUNY	9	2	7	18
CBOS	25	4	12	41
BOE*	11	0	57	68
TOTAL	45	6	76	127

*Information on regions 1-13. Other information was not reported.

TABLE 29
NUMBER OF TEACHERS BY HOURS WORKED PER WEEK

	LESS THAN 20 HOURS	20-35 HOURS	35 HOURS	TOTAL
CUNY	80	17	10	107
CBOS	94	21	23	138
BOE*	461	169	0	630
TOTAL	635	207	33	875

*Information on regions 1-13. An additional 137 teachers were reported from other regions.

TABLE 30
NUMBER OF COUNSELORS BY HOURS WORKED PER WEEK

	LESS THAN 20 HOURS	20-35 HOURS	35 HOURS	TOTAL
CUNY	10	2	1	13
CBOS	20	1	8	29
BOE*	0	32	0	32
TOTAL	30	35	9	74

*Information on regions 1-13.

TABLE 31
NUMBER OF PARAPROFESSIONALS BY HOURS WORKED PER WEEK

	LESS THAN 20 HOURS	20-35 HOURS	35 HOURS	TOTAL
CUNY	26	1	0	27
CBOS	31	3	1	35
BOE*	38	87	22	147
TOTAL	95	91	23	209

TABLE 32
NUMBER OF UNPAID VOLUNTEERS

	ADMIN & SUP	TEACHERS	COUNSELORS	PARAS	TOTAL
CUNY	0	1	0	31	32
CBOS	5	135	7	31	178
BOE	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	5	136	7	62	210

B. Staff Development Hours*

Each instructional program was required to provide opportunities for staff development to its teachers, as follows: for full-time experienced teachers, a minimum of 20 hours; for full-time inexperienced teachers, a minimum of 30 hours; for part-time experienced teachers, a minimum of 10 hours; and for part-time inexperienced teachers, a minimum of 15 hours.

The following table summarizes the staff development hours required and actually received by teachers in the three agencies. Each agency provided substantially more staff development than was required. Only for full-time inexperienced teachers were fewer hours received than were required.

TABLE 33
NUMBER OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT HOURS

	FT EXP		FT INEXP		PT EXP		PT INEXP		TOTAL	
	REQ	RECD	REQ	RECD	REQ	RECD	REQ	RECD	REQ	RECD
CUNY	460	721	0	0	880	1,101	30	38	1,370	1,860
CBOS	900	1,484	165	193	790	1,179	130	138	1,985	2,994
BOE	3,920	4,644	720	546	4,880	6,644	870	1,112	10,390	12,946
TOTAL	5,280	6,849	885	739	6,550	8,924	1,030	1,288	13,745	17,800

C. Types of Staff Development

Programs were asked to describe their staff development programs in the narrative section of the final report form. A set of formats and a set of topics were extrapolated from their responses. Only the most common responses will be discussed here. Since this question was open-ended, the numbers in the following tables should not be considered exact.

Table 34 lists the most common formats of staff development. The most common by far was workshops, followed by conferences, networking, staff meetings, and observations with feedback.

*This section of the report and the sections on Self-Analysis of Program Performance and Technical Assistance Needs are based upon narrative reports from 10 CUNY colleges, 31 CBOs, and 21 regions from the BOE.

TABLE 34
FORMATS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	CUNY	CBOS	BOE	TOTAL
Workshops	6	23	15	44
Conferences	5	18	7	30
Networking	7	11	7	25
Staff Meetings	5	15	4	24
Observations, Feedback	3	5	14	22
LAC Workshops	3	11	2	16
Materials Displays/Reviews	3	5	5	13
Discussion/Study Groups	1	4	6	11
Ori. lc.s	3	2	6	11
College/Grad. Courses	1	5	4	10
Professional Materials	1	5	4	10

The most common topic of staff development was teaching techniques and strategies for adult basic education (BE). Oth. common topics were instructional materials for BE, teaching techniq s for ESOL, and techniques for teaching writing. All of these topics reflect the programs' concern for the quality of services delivered in the classroom. During the first year of implementation (1984-85), the topics of testing and record-keeping were much more common than this year, suggesting that programs are more comfortable with these procedures now. Table 35 presents the most common topics of staff development.

TABLE 35
TOPICS OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

	CUNY	CBOS	BOE	TOTAL
Teaching techniques - BE	6	18	11	35
Instructional mats. - BE	7	10	6	23
Teaching techniques - ESOL	6	8	9	23
Teaching writing	3	5	15	23
Assess. stud. needs/progress	3	10	6	19
Testing	4	9	6	19
Curriculum development	4	5	8	17
Instructional mats. - ESOL	6	3	6	15
GED test	1	1	12	14
Record-keeping	4	5	3	12
Adult learner	1	4	5	10
Classrm. mgt./lesson plans	1	3	6	10
Issues	2	5	3	10

VI. SELF-ANALYSIS OF PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

A. Features and Accomplishments

Programs were also asked to analyze their performance over fiscal year 1986 in the narrative section of the final report. This was an open-ended question, allowing programs to highlight what they chose. The most common responses are summarized in the following tables, which comprise program accomplishments and features.

The accomplishment highlighted by most programs was student progress on standardized tests. This was followed by the fact that they met or surpassed projections and student placements (jobs, other education, training programs, etc.) after completing the program.

TABLE 36
PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

	CUNY	CBOS	BOE	TOTAL
Student progress on tests	7	22	11	40
Met/surpassed projections	5	16	—	21
Stud. placements after program	1	14	6	21
Good/better stud. retention	2	8	1	11
Good/better stud. attendance	2	2	5	9
Stud. increased self-esteem	2	7	—	9

Among program features highlighted in the narratives, the most common were the presence of supplementary services, expansion or a new program, and better or more counseling for students. The following table summarizes program responses.

TABLE 37
PROGRAM FEATURES

	CUNY	CBOS	BOE	TOTAL
Supplementary services	5	15	9	29
Expansion/new program	2	3	15	20
Better/more counseling	4	7	5	16
Wide range of classes	1	2	8	11
Serving lowest level	1	8	—	9

B. Program Difficulties

Many programs discussed their difficulties as well as their accomplishments. The most common were student retention and attendance, followed by post-testing and student recruitment, as shown in the following table.

TABLE 38
PROGRAM DIFFICULTIES

	CUNY	CBOS	BOE	TOTAL
Student retention	5	4	5	14
Student attendance	2	4	7	13
Post-testing	4	3	—	7
Student recruitment	—	4	2	6

C. Technical Assistance Needs

As in the final report for fiscal year 1985, programs' requests for technical assistance varied greatly. This suggests a need for the LAC to maintain ongoing, close contact with individual programs to offer technical assistance geared to their specific needs. Some of the requests in the narratives reflected these specific program needs, while others were actually requests for additional funds or staff. The more general, common responses are listed in the following tables.

Some technical assistance requests indicated areas of general need. The most common of these was for assistance with student recruitment through publicity and outreach. This was followed by requests for assistance with record-keeping and sharing effective materials. The most common areas of need are summarized in the following table.

TABLE 39
AREAS OF NEED FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

	CUNY	CBOS	BOE	TOTAL
Student recruitment/retention	5	6	10	21
Record-keeping	4	11	5	20
Sharing effective materials	2	10	8	19
Design/find better tests	3	9	5	17
Student referral	3	6	5	14
Computerized rec.keeping	—	4	4	8
Curriculum development	—	3	5	8
Inst. uses of computer	—	5	3	8
Teacher recruitment	1	1	5	7

Other program responses indicated the form of technical assistance they need. The most common form requested was workshops. Many programs also requested more opportunities for professional networking. The most common responses are summarized in the following table.

TABLE 40
FORMS OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTED

	CUNY	CBOS	BOE	TOTAL
More workshops	4	15	15	3
Networking	6	11	9	26
On-site assistance/wkshops	3	7	4	14
Trng/support for counselors	3	4	4	11
Professional literature	2	5	1	8
Video library/equipment	1	1	4	6

VII. PROGRAM EXPENDITURES

Estimating the cost of providing literacy services in New York City is difficult considering the great diversity of program size and type of agency. For BE, 0-8.9 and ESOL instructional services a total of $15,081,977 of City and State funds was spent during fiscal year 1986 for the services described in Part I of the report, an increase of $3,639,534 over FY 1985. These funds were distributed as follows: $1,807,313 to CUNY colleges; $1,983,098 to CBOs; and $11,291,566 to the Board of Education. CUNY colleges received $399,469 more than in FY 1985; CBOs received $269,334 more than in FY 1985; and the Board of Education received $2,970,731 more than in FY 1985. To explore the relationship between funds spent and literacy services provided, three areas were examined: students, instructional hours, including testing hours, and contact hours, also including testing time.

Table 41 summarizes the number and proportion of total students, instructional hours, contact hours, and funds for all three agencies.

TABLE 41
EXPENDITURE COMPARISON AMONG AGENCIES

	GRANT	STUDENTS	INST. HOURS	CONTACT HOURS
CUNY*	$1,807,313	4,519	38,212	483,914
	12.0%	10.2%	10.7%	12.5%
CBOS	$1,983,098	6,527	65,064	688,137
	13.0%	14.8%	18.3%	17.8%
BOE	$11,291,566	33,120	252,539	2,692,516
	75.0%	75.0%	71.0%	69.7%
TOTAL	$15,081,977	44,166	355,815	3,864,567
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Based on the figures presented in the preceding table, the costs per student, per instructional hour, and per contact hour are presented in Table 42.

*These figures do not include the $331,268 of AEA funds, the funds provided by CUNY to support the CUNY pre-GED and GED program, or the 5,745 students served in those programs.

46

TABLE 42
COSTS OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

	COST PER INST.HR.	COST PER CONT.HR.	COST PER STUDENT
CUNY	$38	$3	$317
CBOS	$28	$3	$271
BOE	$52	$5	$383
AVERAGE	$46	$4	$360

The variations in these costs reflect the many variations among and within each agency as well as the diversity of services offered. It was impossible, within the scope of this report and the data received, to estimate in-kind resources used to support literacy services. In addition, as reported this year for the first time, many CUNY colleges and CBOs relied heavily on the use of volunteers. Moreover, factors such as the level of students' skills, class size, and attendance rates for programs affect cost figures.

Nonetheless, these cost figures do allow some conclusions to be made. The average cost for an instructional hour was approximately $46, about $5 more than in FY 1985. According to attendance data presented earlier, this provided on the average an hour of instruction to 11 students (the same number as in FY 1985). The average cost per student was about $360, nearly $65 more than in FY 1985. Each student, on the average, attended 80 hours of instruction (4 more hours than in FY 1985). The cost per contact hour was approximately the same as in FY 1985. It must be said, however, that it is impossible to assign a dollar value to the positive impact of these programs on the students served.

PART 2

SERVICES OF THE PUBLIC LIBRARY
LITERACY PROGRAMS

I. SERVICES

MAC funds were used for adult literacy learning centers at the three New York City public library systems: the Brooklyn Public Library, the Queens Borough Public Library, and the New York Public Library (serving Manhattan, the Bronx, and Staten Island). In FY 1985, all three systems renovated space, hired and trained new staff, and developed or expanded collections designed to assist both students and literacy providers. These activities continued in FY 1986, with direct services to students being greatly expanded during this year.

Students and Users

The library programs offered four basic services: individual tutoring programs, small group programs, computer-assisted instruction (CAI), and drop-in use of the adult literacy collections. Table 43 summarizes the use of tutoring and small group services as reported by the libraries.

TABLE 43
USE OF ADULT LITERACY SERVICES AT THE PUBLIC LIBRARIES

	NYPL	BKLYN	QUEENS	TOTAL
BASIC ED				
Tutorial	30	429	158	617
Small Group	481	92	66	639
Subtotal	511	521	224	1,256
ESOL				
Tutorial	0	0	0	0
Small Group	0	0	171	171
Subtotal	0	J	171	171
TOTAL STUDENTS	511	521	395	1,427

These figures represent a substantial increase over FY 1985 in the number of students served. In FY 1986, 1,427 students received instruction compared with 694 students the previous year. All three library systems also made computers available to offer computer-assisted instruction, and maintained adult literacy book collections for student use.

II. AMOUNT OF INSTRUCTION RECEIVED BY STUDENTS

As with the instructional programs offered by CUNY, community-based organizations, and the Board of Education, the amount of instruction received by students at the public library programs was measured by instructional hours, contact hours, and contact hours per student. The totals in these categories are presented in the paragraphs that follow.

A. Instructional Hours

A total of 23,353 instructional hours was provided by the public library programs. Of this total, 22,742 was in basic education: 12,901 in tutorial instruction and 9,841 in small group instruction. In ESOL, 611 instructional hours were provided, all in small group instruction. All three library systems offered virtually the same number of instructional hours: New York Public Library offered 7,781; Brooklyn offered 7,584; and Queens offered 7,988. For Brooklyn and Queens, the largest number of instructional hours was in basic education tutorial instruction. For the New York Public Library, it was in basic education small group instruction. Queens Borough Public Library was the only one to offer ESOL instruction. Table 44 presents the instructional hours by type of instruction.

TABLE 44
NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL HOURS BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTION

	BE TUT.	BE SM.GRP.	ESOL TUT.	ESOL SM.GRP.	TOTAL
NYPL	N/A*	7,781	0	0	7,781
B'LYN	6,048	1,536	0	0	7,584
QUEENS	6,853	524	0	611	7,988
TOTAL	12,901	9,841	0	611	23,353

* Incorporated in BE Sm. Grp. figure

(1) The New York Public Library also offers ESOL instruction but it is provided at the Riverside Adult Learning Center whose data are reported in Part 1 with CBOs.

B. Contact Hours

The library programs reported a total of 40,133 contact hours. Of this total, 37,532 contact hours were in basic education: 12,901 in tutorial instruction and 24,631 in small group instruction. A total of 2,601 contact hours was reported for ESOL, all in small group instruction. Like instructional hours, the contact hours by library system were all quite similar for NYPL; 13,440 for Brooklyn and 13,105 for Queens. Table 45 presents the contact hours by type of instruction.

TABLE 45
NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTION

	BE TUT.	BE SM.GRP.	ESOL TUT.	ESOL SM.GRP.	TOTAL
NYPL	N/A*	13,588	0	0	13,588
BKLYN	6,048	7,392	0	0	13,440
QUEENS	5,853	3,651	0	2,601	13,105
TOTAL	12,901	24,631	0	2,601	40,133

* Incorporated in BE Sm. Grp. figure

Libraries also provided other types of educational and supportive services for its students, such as field trips, counseling services, and student input into service delivery.

C. Contact Hours per Student

The average number of contact hours per student for all programs was 28. For NYPL, it was 27; for Brooklyn, it was 26. Queens had the highest number of contact hours per student at 33.

The average number of contact hours per student was twice as high for basic education students (30) than for ESOL (15).

III. LOCATIONS

Each public library system has established programs at several sites. Learning Centers offer a broad array of services which include direct staff consultation and small group instruction, and perhaps computer assisted instruction. In some cases, these learning centers or the central library work with other branch libraries, called "satellites." Satellites have adult literacy deposit collections and host individual tutoring sessions. The number of learning center sites and satellites is presented in Table 46.

TABLE 46
NUMBER OF LOCATIONS FOR PUBLIC LIBRARY PROGRAMS

	LEARNING CENTERS	SATELLITES	TOTAL
NEW YORK	7	2	9
BROOKLYN	5	10	15
QUEENS	5	0	5
TOTAL	17	12	29

The New York Public Library locations included 3 learning centers in Manhattan, 1 center in Staten Island, and 3 centers and 2 satellites in the Bronx. The total number of library sites, 29, was the same as in FY 1985.*

IV. MATERIALS

Each of the library-operated literacy centers contains a broad collection of instructional and professional materials in basic education and English for speakers of other languages. These materials are available for loan to individuals, and some of the centers also have deposit collections available for use over a prolonged period of time (up to several months) by other literacy programs in the area.

*The FY 1985 report included a miscalculation of the number of NY Public Library Satellites by counting 5 outposted ESOL class locations as satellite centers. There were 29 total library sites in FY 1985.

A. Print Materials

All three library systems continued to add to their collections of adult education print materials for their literacy centers. These materials include books, periodicals, and other print materials. Table 47 summarizes the number of items purchased in FY 1986 by each library system for use by basic education and ESOL students and adult literacy professionals. While most materials were categorized for BE, libraries mentioned that BE materials were appropriate for ESOL instruction as well.

TABLE 47
NUMBER OF PRINT ITEMS PURCHASED BY LIBRARIES BY CATEGORY

	NYPL	BKLYN	QUEENS	TOTAL
Basic Ed	20,051	35,226	18,405	73,682
ESOL	2,224	775	3,678	6,677
Professional	298	717	68	1,083
TOTAL	22,573	35,718	22,151	81,442

B. Audiovisual and Computer Materials

Many literacy centers also offered computer-assisted instruction and audiovisual resources. A total of 2,195 items were purchased this year, in four categories: computer software, audio tapes, videotapes, and other materials. Table 48 presents the number of items purchased by each library system in each category.

TABLE 48
NUMBER OF AUDIOVISUAL ITEMS PURCHASED BY LIBRARIES BY CATEGORY

	NYPL	BKLYN	QUEENS	TOTAL
COMP. SOFTWARE	271	506	65	842
AUDIO TAPES	21	60	1,111	1,192
VIDEOTAPES	21	0	0	21
OTHER	140	0	0	140
TOTAL	453	566	1,176	2,195

V. STAFFING

The library programs all operated with staff who were responsible for administrative, clerical, collection maintenance, training, outreach, and client services tasks. The Brooklyn Public Library, with 18 full-time and 3 part-time people, had the largest staff. The Queens Borough Public Library had 14 full-time staff members, and the New York Public Library had 11.

A. Volunteers

In addition to its paid staff, each library program used a large number of volunteers, who conducted both one-on-one tutoring sessions as well as small group instruction. Table 49 presents the number of volunteers by type of instruction for all three library systems.

TABLE 49
NUMBER OF VOLUNTEERS BY TYPE OF INSTRUCTION

	NYPL	BKLYN	QUEENS	TOTAL
BASIC ED.				
Tutorial	30	389	126	545
Small group	193	16	1	210
Subtotal	223	405	127	755
ESOL				
Tutorial	0	0	N/A	0
Small group	0	0	N/A	0
Subtotal	0	0	N/A	0
VOLS. IN TRAINING				
Wtg. assignment	5	17	0	22
In training	0	5	0	5
Wtg. training	55	35	195	285
Subtotal	60	57	195	312
TOTAL	283	462	342	1,087

The numbers of volunteers in each category for each library system is consistent with the instruction reported for that category. For example, NYPL is the only program which used most of its volunteers for BE small group instruction; that is consistent with its reporting of most students in BE small group instruction. Brooklyn and Queens reported most of their volunteers in BE tutorial instruction, also in keeping with the number of students reported in BE tutoring.

B. Staff Development

As in FY 1985, staff attended a variety of professional development activities which were held at the central library systems' offices, at the branches and by other organizations. These activities took a number of forms — retreats and conferences, workshops and seminars, staff meetings and presentations, idea exchanges and peer observation and feedback. The topics of these activities were equally diverse and included reading and writing, use of computers, testing, tutor training, learning disabilities, and instructional approaches for BE and ESOL students.

VI. EXPENDITURES

A total of $1,926,000 was spent by the three public library systems: $1,401,812 for personnel services and $524,188 for other than personnel services. Among OTPS expenditures $290,665 was for print materials for students and professionals; $68,962 for audiovisual and computer materials; $114,408 for furniture and equipment; and $50,153 for renovations. This compares with $1,085,743 in FY 1985: $409,188 for print materials; $220,201 for audiovisual and computer hardware and materials; $198,642 for furniture and office equipment; and $257,712 for renovation. Since FY 1985 was the first year for the library literacy center, funds were needed to renovate and equip the center. In every OTPS category, much less was spent in FY 1986 than in FY 1985. The FY 1986 expenditures are presented by category in the following table.

TABLE 50
PUBLIC LIBRARY OTPS EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORY

	NYPL	BKLYN	QUEENS	TOTAL
OTPS				
PRINT MATERIALS				
BE	$103,275	$104,043	$31,510	$238,828
ESOL	15,350	0	23,992	39,342
Professional	10,939	0	1,556	12,495
Subtotal	129,564	104,043	57,058	290,665
AV/COMP.MATERIALS				
Comp.software	25,065	N/A	7,113	32,178
Audio tapes	365	N/A	26,090	26,455
Videotapes	1,329	N/A	0	1,329
Other	9,000	N/A	0	9,000
Subtotal	35,759	N/A	33,203	68,962
FURN./EQUIP.	79,160	20,813	14,435	114,408
RENOVATIONS	23,796	0	26,357	50,153
TOTAL	$268,279	$124,856	$131,053	$524,188

SUMMARY

This final report describes literacy services during the second year of the New York City Adult Literacy Initiative (July 1, 1985 - June 30, 1986) supported by funds from the Municipal Assistance Corporation and funds administered by the State Education Department including Adult Education Act (AEA), Welfare Education Program (WEP), and Employment Preparation Education (EPE) funds. During this period, literacy services were provided by 10 colleges of the City University of New York and 33 community based organizations under contract with the New York City Community Development Agency; the New York City Board of Education provided over 700 classes across 22 regions and the public libraries operated 17 literacy centers and 12 satellite locations.

A total of 48,515 students received instruction in classes, labs, or tutorial sessions in programs throughout the five boroughs of New York City. There was a wide range in the size of literacy programs, from programs serving fewer than 50 students in two or three classes, through those serving ten times that number in dozens of classes, to regions of the Board of Education serving over 2000 students at multiple sites throughout the region. Tutorials, small group instruction and labs were available at many programs, in addition to traditional classroom instruction. Well over 1,000 volunteers were used by programs throughout the system. The average attendance for all programs was the same as last year at 11 students per session.

The student population served in this second year of the literacy initiative closely resembles the first year population. Ninety percent of the students in FY 1986 were minority, 60% were female and 40% males. As in the previous year, ages ranged from 16 to over 65 with the majority, 52%, between 25 and 44 years old. A notably larger share of students were employed in FY 1986 -- 49% vs. 45% in FY 1985; and a slightly larger share 19% vs. 17% were receiving public assistance.

Whereas the first year of the Literacy Initiative was characterized by enormous expansion, the second year could be characterized by stability, improvement and cooperation. A total of $17,007,977 was spent in fiscal year 1987 across the system. This represents an increase of $3,998,118 over FY 1985. While the number of students increased by over 8,000, and the amount of funding increased, the number of sites and providers remained about the same. This stability provided the opportunity for all levels involved in this initiative -- City, State and Federal funders; LPAs; program managers and staff -- to discover and nurture a variety of cooperative ventures sharing space, resources, developmental activities, information and innovations.

Fiscal year 1986 has been an important one for the New York City Adult Literacy Initiative. This enormous and unprecedented system of providers and services has gained a firm foothold and can continue to develop in quality and be prepared to meet the challenges that will undoubtedly arise in the future.

APPENDIX

Summary Data for
Fiscal Year 1986

for Literacy Programs Operated by
the City University of New York,
Community Based Organizations
and
the New York City Board of Education

Summary Data for Instructional Programs

Final Report for Fiscal Year 1986

Table of Contents

FINAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

	TOTAL #	%	GRAND TOTAL %
PAGE 1			
I. STUDENTS			
A.BE		**BE %**	
0-2.9	2313	12.3%	5.2%
3-4.9	3481	18.6%	7.9%
SUBTOTAL	5794	30.9%	13.1%
5-6.9	6289	33.6%	14.2%
7-8.9	2851	15.2%	6.5%
7-8.9(HSE)	3806	20.3%	8.6%
SUBTOTAL	12946	69.1%	29.3%
BE TOTAL	18740	100.0%	42.4%
B.ESOL		**ESOL %**	
I	11666	49.1%	26.4%
II	5529	23.3%	12.5%
SUBTOTAL	17195	72.4%	38.9%
III	4426	18.6%	10.0%
IV	2128	9.0%	4.8%
SUBTOTAL	6554	27.6%	14.8%
ESOL TOTAL	23749	100.0%	53.8%
C.BENL		**BENL %**	
0-2.9	165	14.7%	0.4%
3-4.9	446	39.7%	1.0%
SUBTOTAL	611	54.4%	1.4%
5-6.9	320	28.5%	0.7%
7-8.9	193	17.2%	0.4%
SUBTOTAL	513	45.6%	1.2%
BENL TOTAL	1124	100.0%	2.5%
D.MATH		**MATH %**	
0-2.9	43	7.8%	0.1%
3-4.9	172	31.1%	0.4%
SUBTOTAL	215	38.9%	0.5%
5-6.9	218	39.4%	0.5%
7-8.9	120	21.7%	0.3%
SUBTOTAL	338	61.1%	0.8%
MATH TOTAL	553	100.0%	1.3%
GRAND TOTAL STUDENTS	44166		100.0%

	TOTAL #	%
PAGE 2		
II. STUDENTS BY LEVEL		
A. 0-4.9/I-II	23815	53.9%
B. 5-8.9/III-IV	20351	46.1%
C. TOT ST BY LEVEL	44166	100.0%

	TOTAL	
	#	%

PAGE 3
III. STUDENTS WITH POST TEST

		BE %
A.BE POST TEST		
0-2.9	1158	50.1%
3-4.9	1755	50.4%
SUBTOTAL	2913	50.3%
5-6.9	2989	47.5%
7-8.9	1298	45.5%
7-8.9 HSE	1302	34.2%
SUBTOTAL	5589	43.2%
BE TOTAL	8502	45.4%
B.ESOL POST TEST		ESOL %
I	5730	49.1%
II	3090	55.9%
SUBTOTAL	8820	51.3%
III	2474	55.9%
IV	1218	57.2%
SUBTOTAL	3692	56.3%
ESOL TOTAL	12512	52.7%
C.BENL POST TEST	569	50.6%
D.MATH POST TEST	298	53.9%
GRAND TOTAL POST TEST	21881	49.5%

FINAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

		TOTAL #	%	GRAND TOTAL %
PAGE 4				
IV. GAIN				
A. BE GAIN			GAIN/ POST	GAIN/ STUDENTS
	0-2.9	499	43.1%	21.6%
	3-4.9	909	51.8%	26.1%
	SUBTOTAL	1408	48.3%	24.3%
	5-6.9	1338	44.8%	21.3%
	7-8.9	595	45.8%	20.9%
	HSE	365	28.0%	9.6%
	SUBTOTAL	1933	34.6%	14.9%
BE TOTAL		3341	39.3%	17.8%
B. ESOL GAIN			GAIN/ POST	GAIN/ STUDENTS
	I	2275	39.7%	19.5%
	II	1272	41.2%	23.0%
	SUBTOTAL	3547	40.2%	20.6%
	III	440	17.8%	9.9%
	IV	41	3.4%	1.9%
	SUBTOTAL	481	13.0%	7.3%
ESOL TOTAL		4028	32.2%	17.0%
C. BENL GAIN		170	29.88%	15.1%
D. MATH GAIN		174	58.39%	31.5%
GRAND TOTAL GAIN		7713		

* BE, BENL, MATH: Gain is one year or more.
  ESOL: Gain is 20 points or more.

FINAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

	TOTAL #	%	GRAND TOTAL %
PAGE 5			
V. INSTRUCTIONAL HOURS			
A.BE			
1. 0-4.9	86248	47.8%	25.0%
2. 5-8.9	94175	52.2%	27.3%
3. BE TOTAL	180423	100.0%	52.3%
B.ESOL			
1. I/II	106008	68.7%	30.7%
2. III/IV	48275	31.3%	14.0%
3. ESOL TOTAL	154283	100.0%	44.7%
C.BENL			
1. 0-4.9	4882	61.5%	1.4%
2. 5-8.9	3050	38.5%	0.9%
3. BENL TOTAL	7932	100.0%	2.3%
D.MATH			
1. 0-4.9	1519	60.7%	0.4%
2. 5-8.9	985	39.3%	0.3%
3. MATH TOTAL	2504	100.0%	0.7%
GRAND TOTAL	345142		100.0%

	TOTAL #
E. TESTING HOURS	10673
F. TEST HRS/INST HRS	0.03
GRAND TOTAL (A, B, C, D & E)	355815

FINAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

	TOTAL #	%	GRAND TOTAL %
PAGE 6			
VI.CONTACT HOURS			
A.BE			
1. 0-4.9	655946	40.9%	17.2%
2. 5-8.9	947351	59.1%	24.8%
3. BE TOTAL	1603297	100.0%	42.0%
B.ESOL			
1. I/II	1484837	70.2%	38.9%
2. III/IV	628943	29.8%	16.5%
3. ESOL TOTAL	2113780	100.0%	.4%
C.BENL			
1. 0-4.9	50693	69.3%	1.3%
2. 5-8.9	22464	30.7%	0.6%
3. BENL TOTAL	73157	100.0%	1.9%
D.MATH			
1. 0-4.9	13803	57.2%	0.4%
2. 5-8.9	10331	42.8%	0.3%
3. MATH TOTAL	24134	100.0%	0.6%
GRAND TOTAL	3814368		100.0%
E.TESTING HOURS	50199		
GRAND TOTAL (A, B, C, D, & E)	3864567		

	TOTAL #
PAGE 7	
VII. CONTACT HRS/STUDENTS	
A.BE	
1. 0-4.9	113
2. 5-8.9	73
3. BE TOTAL	86
B.ESOL	
1. I/II	86
2. III/IV	96
3. ESOL TOTAL	89
C.BENL	
1. 0-4.9	83
2. 5-8.9	44
3. BENL TOTAL	65
D.MATH	
1. 0-4.9	64
2. 5-8.9	31
3. MATH TOTAL	44
GRAND TOTAL	80

VIII.CONTACT HOURS/INSTRUCTION HOURS	
A.BE	
1. 0-4.9	8
2. 5-8.9	10
3. BE	9
B.ESOL	
1. I/II	14
2. III/IV	13
3. ESOL	14
C.BENL	
1. 0-4.9	10
2. 5-8.9	7
3. BENL	9
D.MATH	
1. 0-4.9	9
2. 5-8.9	10
3. MATH	10
GRAND TOTAL	11

FINAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

	TOTAL $
PAGE 8	
XIV. COSTS	
A. TOTAL GRANT	$15,885,435
B. COST PER INST HR	
1.EXCLUDING TEST HRS	$46.03
2.INCLUDING TEST HRS	$44.65
C. COST PER CONTACT HOUR	
1. EXCLUDING TEST HRS	$4.16
2. INCLUDING TEST HRS	$4.11
D. COST PER STUDENT	$393.59

FINAL REPORT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1986

	TOTAL #	%	GRAND TOTAL %

PAGE 9
OTHER STUDENT INFORMATION FOR 0-8.9 AND ESOL
X. ETHNICITY AND RACE

	TOTAL #	%	GRAND TOTAL %
AMER NAT	156	0.4%	
ASIAN	4684	10.8%	
BLACK	13528	31.1%	
HISPANIC	21134	48.6%	
WHITE/OTHER	3975	9.1%	
TOTAL ETHNICITY & RACE	43477	100.0%	

XI. AGE/GENDER
A. AGE GROUPINGS: MALE

	TOTAL #	%	GRAND TOTAL %
16-20 YEARS	2951	17.0%	
21-24	3202	18.4%	
25-44	8994	51.8%	
45-59	1804	10.4%	
60+	405	2.3%	
TOTAL MALE	17356	100.0%	39.6%

B. AGE GROUPS: FEMALE

	TOTAL #	%	GRAND TOTAL %
16-20 YEARS	3123	11.8%	
21-24	3952	14.9%	
25-44	14533	54.9%	
45-59	4022	15.2%	
60+	857	3.2%	
TOTAL FEMALE	26487	100.0%	60.4%

C. AGE GROUPS: TOTAL

	TOTAL #	%	GRAND TOTAL %
16-20 YEARS	6074	13.9%	
21-24	7154	16.3%	
25-44	23527	53.7%	
45-59	5826	13.3%	
60+	1262	2.9%	
TOTAL AGE	43843	100.0%	100.0%